REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Final Office Action mailed on March 26, 2010 within two months. Claims 1, 3-10, 13, and 15-19 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-10, 13, and 15-19. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter is entered with these amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 112

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-10, 13, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner rejects the added claim language of "at least one of the software programs accessing at least one other of the software programs" as lacking support in the specification.

Paragraph [0031], as listed in the published application, states "Architecture 701 illustrates how the programs in software stack 50 communicate with each other." Furthermore paragraph [0032] states "program 52 provides primary processing of transactions and can call or otherwise access the other programs to provide a compete solution to transaction processing." More simply stated, program 52 can access other programs. Still more, paragraph [0033] states "[t]hese programs accessed by Business One (SAP) program 52 may also interact between each other to process transactions." As such, Applicants assert that the specification adequately supports that at least one of the software programs accessing at least one other of the software programs. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the 112 rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-10, 13, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lai et al, US Patent No. 5,706,429 ("*Lai*") in view of *Helland* et al, US Patent No. 5,890,161 ("*Helland*"), Suorsa US Patent No. 7,124,289 ("*Suorsa*"), Yu US Patent No. 5,433,483 ("*Yu*"), Roche US Patent No. 4,879,557 ("*Roche*"), Vaghi US Patent No. 6,047,273 ("*Vaghi*"), and Taylor et al US Patent No. 6,256,676 ("*Taylor*"). Applicants respectfully disagree with these rejections, but Applicants present claim amendments in order to clarify the patentable aspects of the claims and to expedite prosecution.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging that *Lai* fails to teach a remote processing and particular software services, including credit card processing, calculation of taxes, warehouse management, shipping and invoicing. (see office action page 3) *Lai* does disclose a simple system for processing a transaction in which a terminal sends the transaction to a computer and the computer processes the entire transaction. The processing includes evaluating information within the transaction, creating a protocol based on that information, managing the transaction based the protocol, sending transactions to a management system, and applying a proper application by the information management system. (See Fig. 4) Again, to reiterate, this entire process occurs on a single computer associated with related terminals. (See Fig. 2 and related description)

Helland does not cure the shortcomings in Lai, instead *Helland* discloses a system wherein the operating system 35, applications 36, modules 37, and data 38 are stored inside of the memory (e.g. hard drive 27 and/or RAM 25) of computer 20. (See Fig. 1, Fig. 2 and related description) While *Helland* does make mention of a task being remotely processed in column 4, line 63 through column 5, line 3, *Helland* discloses a system architecture substantially different than that recited in the present claims. *Helland* discloses a client server system (as depicted in figure 2 and described in column 7 lines 23-32) similar to that disclosed in Lai. Specifically a client computer accesses applications on an application server. The Examiner argues that Figure 1 shows a group of applications 36 being remotely processed. However, in column 5 lines 45-50, it is clear that these applications are located on RAM 25 which is a part of server computer 20. While the Examiner is correct that *Hallend* may disclose program modules that are stored in remote memory storage devices, the Examiner is incorrect in asserting that *Helland* teaches these memory storage devices are remote from the server computer. To the contrary, these memory storage devices are located on the server computer as taught in column 5, lines 45-50, but are remote to the client computer 49.

While *Helland* does teach a network relationship between the client computer and the server computer that Lai does not, *Helland* fails to cure the deficencies of Lai in that *Helland* also fails to disclose the specific Method, System, and CRM recited in claims 1, 7, and 8 by which a transaction comes across a network from a first location (the entity, which may be similar to the client in *Helland* and terminal in Lia), the transaction is then processed by the first

software program at a second location (the host system), the first software program selects a remote programs stored at a third location (software solution system).

While *Suorsa, Yu, Roche, Vaghi,* and *Taylor* may merely teach processing, taxes, warehouse management, shipping, and invoicing software, respectively, as the Examiner purports, such references otherwise fail to teach each and every element of the invention, namely those elements discussed above. Furthermore, Applicants assert that the aggregation of so many references to overcome the claims listed herein, especially in light of their disparate teachings, may indicate that their combination is not obvious. Nontheless, the references, alone or in combination, still fail to teach each and every element of the claims.

Significantly, neither *Lai, Helland, Suorsa, Yu, Roche, Vaghi, Taylor,* nor any combination thereof, disclose receiving a transaction from an entity and determining with a first software program on a host system which application (located on another system) is used for processing the transaction. Instead, the references disclose merely a client server relationship with the applications located on the server. As such, the references, alone or in combination, do not disclose or contemplate at least,

> **receiving a request** at a computer based host system for a transaction **from an entity via a network;**

> **utilizing on the computer based host system a first software program** to process the request;

> determining at the computer based host system by the first software program which software programs are used for processing the transaction, the software programs being selected from a plurality of **software programs located on a software solution system** configured as a different system from the host system and the entity, the software programs providing processing for different services;

> accessing the software programs by the first software program via a network to process the transaction, at least one of the software programs accessing at least one other of the software programs;

> receiving results at the computer based host system of the processing from a network; and

> providing the results from the computer based host system to the entity.

as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added) and as similarly recited in independent claims 7 and 8. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7 and 8 are allowable over the cited references.

Dependent claims 3-6, 9-10, 13, and 15-19 variously depend from independent claims 1, 7 and 8, so dependent claims 3-6, 9-10, 13, and 15-19 are allowable over the cited references for the reasons set forth above, in addition to their own unique features, some of which are stated above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims properly set forth that Applicants regard as their invention and are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience, if that would help further prosecution of the subject application. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due to Deposit Account No. 19-2814.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 26, 2010

Robert Shane Capps
Reg. No. 66,045

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6347
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: scapps@swlaw.com